

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

STEVE CRUMP,

No. C 14-5019 RS (PR)

No. C 15-0724 RS (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

v.

DANIEL PARAMO, Warden,

Respondent.

These two federal habeas corpus actions, each of which alleges claims identical to those presented in many prior petitions, e.g., 11-4920 RS, 11-5084 RS, and 13-0010 RS, will be dismissed as premature. They are not ready for review because petitioner's direct appeal is pending, the state appellate court having refused to grant his request to dismiss his appeal. (No. C 15-0724, Pet. at 20.) Therefore, as the Court has informed petitioner in many prior orders, abstention is appropriate because the petitions show no reason justifying this Court's interference in on-going state proceedings. *See Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971). The motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* are GRANTED. The petitions are DISMISSED.

A certificate of appealability will not issue. Petitioner has not shown "that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions, enter judgment in favor of respondent in each action, and close the files.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 26, 2015


RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge

No. C 14-5019 RS (PR)
No. C 15-0724 RS (PR)
ORDER OF DISMISSAL